SPECIAL
COLLECTIONS
DOUGLAS
LIBRARY

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

Doctor *Sacheverell's*
DEFENCE,
IN A
LETTER
TO A
MEMBER of Parliament.
OR,
REMARKS
UPON TWO
Famous Pamphlets,

The one entituled,

A True *Answer* to Doctor *Sacheverell's* Sermon, Preach'd before the Lord Mayor, *November* 5. 1709.

The other (a Sham-Pamphlet) entituled,

Doctor *Sacheverell's* RECANTATION.

By *R. G.*

Ecce par Deo dignum Vir fortis cum Mala fortuna Compositus. Sen.

LONDON: Printed for *John Nutt*, at the *Bishop's-Head* in *Litt'e Britain.* 1710.

Doctor *Sacheverell*'s Defence,

IN A

LETTER

TO A

Member of PARLIAMENT.

Honoured Sir,

AMongst the many Pamphlets that lye so thick upon the Compters in *Westminster-Hall*, you may possibly have taken Notice of Two very Famous Ones, (especially for Untruths,) the One Entituled, *A True Answer to Dr.* Sacheverell's *Sermon*, &c. and the other *Doctor* Sacheverell's *Recantation*.

These Two make a great Noise, and the Party cry them up as unanswerable.

When I had read Two or Three Pages of them I was amaz'd to find the Authors, (who seem to be Persons of Tolerable Learning and Sense, so far abandon'd to their Passions and Interests, as to have no manner of Regard to Truth, or common Honesty, in the Writings they so audaciously publish to the World.

I thought at the same Time it was a Pity such Cheats and Impostures should be tolerated without some Notice taken of them. And finding that Nobody had made any Reply to them, I could not but think it might do some Service to the Publick (to undeceive the Unwary,) by bestowing some few Remarks upon them.

The other little Pamphlets against the Doctor are scarce worth the Hawkers Labour. But these being written by the Champions of the Party, deserve some Observations to be made among them.

The

The Worthy Doctor (when he is enlarg'd) I hope will give all his Adversaries an unanswerable Answer: For he can best do that himself.

The first comes out under the Title of *A True Answer*, and in the Margin of the Title Page retorts upon the Doctor this Paragraph of his Sermon ——— *Why do they pelt her with more Blasphemous Libels, and Scurrilous Lampoons, than ever were publish'd in* Oliver's *Usurpation.*

Dr. Sacheverell's *Sermn*, Nov. 5, 1709.

This Passage of the Dissenters present Behaviour towards the Church, this Malepert Answer applies to the present Behaviour of the Church towards the Dissenters. An easie Way truly of answering Sermons. This is just like the Humour of a Bawd, who to be thought as Vertuous as her Neighbour) returns her Home in her own Language, and *thou art a Whore.* This is more like jumbling of Words, crackling of Thorns, Noise and Flame, than what the Answerer (in his strain'd Eloquence) pretends to find in the Doctor's Sermon; but what immediately follows in this Answerer is most intolerable, *viz.* his Malicious Unchristian Suggestion of the Doctor's ill Life and Conversation. This is acting Satan, the Grand Liar and Accuser, with a Witness. Well, his Angels will do to Christ's Ministers what the Devil did to Christ himself. It is certainly one of the greatest Sins a Man can commit to invent Lies of an Innocent Person. It is sinning as it were with a Cart-rope, as the Prophet expresseth it. The Man must be a Reprobate that can commit so foul a Sin; bid Defiance to his Conscience, and Religion, and Humanity. This is wounding a Man in his most Tender and Sensible Part. The Injury that is done to a Person's Reputation, by telling and publishing a Scandalous Lie of him, is irreparable: For suppose the Liar should have the Grace to Recant, (which is seldom his good Luck,) some will still believe him, not knowing of his Recantation. And therefore such a Reprobate as our Answerer is, were he to swing by his Neck for the Injury he has done the Doctor, by this Barbarous Suggestion, cannot make him sufficient Reparation.

It is Happy the Doctor's Life is so well known to have been so Regular and Exemplary, that this Slanderer could not have done his Cause greater Disservice than by raising such a Report. When the Dissenters are at any Time prest hard by Argument, then they fall to Railing, and run to the Old Pretence of Purity and Strictness, the common Cant of all Sects in all Times; not that they themselves are generally

and in reality, any better than other Men, only they wou'd shew a fair Outside at least, and be thought so.

But this Man was in the Gall of Bitterness: God grant that he may repent him of this Unaccountable Sin, that the Iniquity of his Heart may be forgiven.

After this Scandalous Kind of a Preface, he proceeds to traduce the Doctor guilty in his Sermon of Impropriety of Speech, Nonsence, Impertinence, Lies, and what not? He was aware of the Saying, *----Throw a great deal of Dirt, and some will stick.* Well! But to prove Impropriety of Words and Phrases upon him, he quotes Page the Fifth, where we read [*Conclave of Jesuits,*] which this Answerer thinks should have been more properly [*Congregation of Jesuits.*] Now let me tell him, there is just the same difference between the Term [*Conclave*] and [*Congregation of Jesuits*] as there is between a [*Conventicle*] and a (*Meeting of Schismaticks.*) A Man that is sinking, and has nothing to hold him up above Water will catch at Reeds and Bulrushes. The Answerer does not produce under this Head, so much as One Sentence that is improper, nor indeed impertinent, although he is pleas'd to say, *That to preach against Schism on the 5th of* November, *is to mock God, and to deceive the People.*

What? Was it mocking of God to say, (as the Doctor did) That they were met together that Day to praise God for the Mercies of it? Was it to deceive the People to forewarn them of the Danger of King-killing Principles, and to stand as much upon the Guard against Schism as against Popery.

What Difference, I pray, is there between a Deluded Dissenter and a Deluded Papist? And if both be dangerous to our Church and State, why may not a Sermon on the 5th of *November* be as seasonable against the one as against the other?

The Dissenter will not allow us the same Liberty they take themselves. They call us at all Times Idolaters, Papists, Jacobites, and the worst of Names; and yet if we say but a Word in our own Defence, we must be presently called Persecutors and Disturbers of the publick Peace, and at their Furious Instigation must be treated accordingly.

O! But say their Friends, it is unseasonable to meddle with them now we are engag'd in War with a Formidable Enemy Abroad, and therefore we should endeavour to keep all quiet at Home.

Now, Sir, the Dissenters know too well (without being told) that it is the Nation's Interest to be at Peace with them. And it is their own Interest (if they would consider it) to be at Peace with us. And we solemnly declare we should

be

be glad to be at Peace with them upon Reaſonable Terms. But if they will make Advantage of this War, and take this Opportunity to carry on their Deſigns, in order to undermine us; if theſe Unreaſonable Men will abuſe the Government's Charity and Moderation towards them: Will fly in our Faces, and endeavour to turn us out of our Inheritance, muſt we then ſit ſtill and let them alone? Muſt we ſtay till they become too ſtrong for us? If we do, I doubt we ſhall then pay dear for our Moderation, and find them as Cruel Maſters as ever the *Roman* Catholicks were.

They threaten us already with their Strength and Number; but it is all they can at preſent do, to ſhew their Teeth, and ſnarl at us

This they do to frighten the Queen and Parliament to comply with their Extravagant Demands.

But theſe are meer Bug-bears.

The Fly on the Coach wheel fancies he himſelf makes all the Rattle, and raiſes all the Duſt about him. But, Thanks be to God, we have more than Seven Thouſand in *Iſrael* that have not bow'd to *Baal*. Their Number is not ſo formidable, altho' it wou'd be happy for them and us if it was leſs. It is in this Great City that the Peſtilence rageth moſt. There are many Rich and Populous Towns in the Kingdom that have not a Meeting-Houſe for any Sort of them; and ſome Counties too, that cannot make an Ordinary Congregation. And as for Strength, it is well known the Generality of them are only Poor Mechanicks. The Rich here and there amongſt them are but of Yeſterday, ſprung up (like Muſhrooms) in an Inſtant out of Nothing. And the Majority of theſe have neither Education, Learning, nor any Thing of Religion, beſides Talk and Outſide. And though their Looks betray many of them to be of a Dogged, Obſtinate and Revengeful, Temper, they are not as yet ſo Strong, nor ſo Deſperate, as to dare openly to rebel.

On the other Hand, you may, Sir, aſſure your ſelf there are of the Church of *England* many Men of Noble and Loyal Extraction, of great Fortunes, Power, and Intereſt, Men of Merit, Religion, and Renown, beſides the great Majority of our Gentry and Commonality, that will make, with the Inferior Sort, at leaſt Forty to One Diſſenter, of any One Particular Denomination: So that we need not be afraid of their Number and Strength, (with which they ſo often threaten us,) but truſt to the Captain of our Salvation, who has more than Ten Legions at his Command, that will be too many for Rebels, (how numerous ſoever,) let them begin when they will.

For these Reasons, if they be wise they will sit still, and be contented with what they at present enjoy with Peace, rather than provoke us to return upon them the many Injuries and Indignities they have offer'd us hitherto with Impunity.

But, Sir, to return: Would you know what it is that really galls them in this Sermon? Why truly, Sir, it is this: The Doctor endeavour'd to clear the Church of *England* of what the Papists falsly charge Her with, *viz.* of being equally guilty with the Dissenters of resisting and deposing our Kings; so that now, say the Papists, the Church and Dissenters both have laid aside the Doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-resistance. No, says the Doctor, the Church of *England* did not depose King *James VI & Armis*, nor settle the Crown upon the Prince of *Orange* upon the Deposing Power, but upon the Vacancy of the Throne. And I hope it will appear from the Parliament's Proceedings against the Doctor, that what he has told us, *viz.* That King *William* solemnly disclaim'd the least Imputation of Resistance in his Declaration is neither strange nor absurd, as our True Answerer would have it.

Is this to be a Friend to the Papists, as these Sons of Slander represent the Doctor? What to deprive the Dissenters of the Deposing Power? Alas! This is it; to convince them they must no longer resist or rebel, (no, not for their Gain,) is a Thought that strikes them to their very Heart.

If the Doctor was the more Zealous at this Time of Day, had he not Cause?

St. *Stephen* (though he lost his Life for it) thought it not unseasonable to tell the *Jews* to their very Faces, they were the Betrayers and Murderers of the Prophets, and of our Lord himself; *Ye Stiff-necked*, says he, *and Uncircumcised in Heart, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your Fathers did, so do ye.*

And now why may not such a Severity be justifiable against Rebellion and King killing Principles?

Is it not the Just Judgment of God upon the Dissenters, the Curse of *Cain*, the First Murderer, for every One that finds them, whether upon the 5th of *November* or the 30th of *January*, to have a Fling at them?

And now the Doctor has prick'd them to the Heart, why do they not repent with the *Jews* at the Preaching of *Peter*, and say, *Men and Brethren what shall we do?* But instead of this they harden their Hearts, are Proof against all Arguments and Entreaties, and think of nothing more; when they are alarm'd, than of justifying their Rebellion and Schism. Why may not then a Minister of the Gospel endeavour

deavour their Converſion? Why may he not in his Zeal for God's Glory, the Good of Souls, the Safety of the Church, Queen, and Kingdom, uſe Boldneſs and Freedom of Speech?

Yea, Woe be to him, and every Miniſter elſe, if he keeps Silence when it is his Duty to ſpeak.

In the next Place, the Anſwerer accuſes the Doctor of Nonſence, and to prove it he produces P. 8, where (by Miſtake) we have the Word [*with*] inſtead of [*without*;] now this might poſſibly be only the Printer's Fault. But granting he found the Word ſo in the Original Copy, was ſuch a Miſtake deſerving of ſo Critical a Remark, when the Author's Meaning might be ſo eaſily conceiv'd without it? This is altogether trifling and ridiculous, and expoſes at once, the Anſwerer's Folly as well as Malice.

He goes on after the ſame Rate, and would fain prove the Doctor guilty of Falſhood, for ſaying the Gun-Powder-Treaſon is a Fact ſo evidently acknowledged, the Papiſts themſelves are ſo far from denying, that they extol it with the higheſt Panegyrick; *Here*, ſays he, *the Doctor does not do the Papiſts Juſtice*, (by the Way, the Papiſts are now oblig'd to the Anſwerer's Moderation towards them,) *the Papiſts*, ſays he, *not only denied the Fact, but alſo condemn'd it as a Villainy, acted by a Deſperate Party of Jeſuits*; I thought the Jeſuits had been Papiſts, till now my Anſwerer tells me the Papiſts had no Hand in the Gun-Powder-Plot, and that it was only carried on by a Party of Jeſuits. This is either Nonſenſe or Contradiction, or both. And whereas he would inſinuate that the Gun-Powder-Treaſon was acted without the Privacy or Conſent of the Papiſts, that is altogether Falſe. For ſure he cann't but know that the Papiſts think it a Meritorious Work to Burn and Extirpate Hereticks; nay, and have the Pope's Diſpenſation, Bleſſing, and Pardon, for it. Now if he and his Party don't think ſo themſelves, why do they charge and accuſe us of Perſecuting them upon the ſame Principles that we are Perſecuted by the Papiſts? Why do they ſay we Perſecute them for the ſame Reaſon that the Papiſts Perſecute us, *viz.* for Religion? We ſee the Diſſenters can Sail with every Wind. One while they ſay the Papiſts Burn, Perſecute and Extirpate Hereticks upon Principles, and now, when it affects them, they come and deny it.

Another Inſtance the Anſwerer gives us of the Doctor's Falſhood is in P. 19, where the Doctor had ſaid, *King* William *diſclaim'd the leaſt Imputation of Reſiſtance in his Decla-*

ration, when I dare be confident, says the Answerer, *this is the first Time the World was ever told of such a Thing.* Poor Man! as confident as he is, the World has been told over and over this; if he is desirous of Conviction let him search the Declaration itself, and Records, ——and it may be he will find that to be true which he is now so confident is otherwise. He is confident with a Witness, and in an angry Mood tells us, ——*the Doctor doth not now tell us any Thing but a false Story.* Well! then it seems (by his own Confession) the Doctor had told some Truths in the foregoing Pages, though they were provoking and unseasonable. And whereas he puts the Question,——*would the Nobility and Gentry have promised to assist the Prince in* England, *without presumirg they must resist the King and all his Popish Army?* I answer, the Majority of the *English* Nobility and Gentry, who invited the Prince over in those Perillous Times, invited him not upon the Power they conceiv'd they had to resist, or depose King *James*; but that the Prince's coming over might be some Awe to him, to prevent the dreadful Persecution they were apprehensive was then ready to break in upon them. That this was their chief Aim, appears from the Case of those who are said to have invited the Priuce into *England*, who nevertheless refused to take the Oaths for him when he was settled upon the Throne. This is said to have been the particular Case of the good Archbishop *Sancroft*.

Now, would they have laid down their Preferments rather than take the Oath for King *William* had they conceiv'd it lawful to depose King *James*? Or would they have invited the Prince over upon the deposing Power, and after that refuse to take the Oath for him? No certainly. And why then will the Dissenters have it so? In short then one Reason is, they wou'd bring in the Church of *England* guilty of Rebellion against King *James*, that they may have something to say to justifie the Murder of King *Charles* the First. This is the Truth of it.

Next, he comes and falls foul upon the Doctor for having abus'd Archbishop *Grindal*. He was a Man of their Turn, and therefore he is very angry with the Doctor, and spends a great deal in the Archbishop's Justification. But what is most Foul in the Answerer is——his Saying, *That the Doctor's Reflection upon the Archbishop was only to cover a Reflection upon Her Present Majesty.* (and now his Hand was in, it is a Wonder he had not brought in the King of *France* too,) and some other Prelate, (I suppose he means the Archbishop of *Canterbury*; now with what Justice can he say that this was to cover

a

a Reflection upon Her Majesty? Was it his comparing Her to Queen *Elizabeth*? Her Royal Majesty Herself will think that no Reflection at all. And if there is any Reflection upon the Archbishop of *Canterbury* it is the Answerer only has made it, by making a Comparison between His Grace and Archbishop *Grindal*. In the same Breath, he says, *the Doctor is not to be trusted with Matters of Fact.* And why so? Because the Doctor affirms the same of the Archbishop, that I suppose the Learned Bishop of *S——m* does in his History of the Reformation. I wonder any Man should have the Impudence to deny such a plain Matter of Fact, so faithfully recorded in the History of those Times. This Answerer takes the same Liberty everywhere else, particularly in p. 16, 17, 18, where he reflects upon Archbishop *Laud* for having disturb'd the Ashes of *Grindal*, whom he highly commends for a Man of Moderation. Now Archbishop *Laud* was a Zealous and Judicious Writer against Popery, and yet the Dissenters could not, and cannot, endure him. The Reason of that is plain: For though he was an Enemy to Popery, yet he was no Friend to Schismaticks.

Our Answerer has now left us but Two or Three Paragraphs more that deserve Remarks: All the rest of it is meer Raillery and Spleen.

In the first of these Paragraphs you find him in his Triumph over the Doctor, for having misapplied a Text of Scripture. *Here*, says he, *I cannot but say, that many a Good Christian would have his Eyes lift up, and his Hair an End, to have heard an Historical Part of Scripture turn'd into an Apparent Falshood.* Behold! The Man is become a Saint all in a Moment; from a Liar and a Slanderer to an Angel of a Sudden. This was the only Mistake he could pick out in the whole Sermon, which is the Reason he makes so much ado about it, as if it was of an Unpardonable Kind: Whereas, in Truth, it is a Mistake of no great Consequence: Nor can it do any Manner of Hurt. It was only a Defect of his Memory, which is many a Sincere Honest Writer's Case. But how often do his Party wrest the Scriptures to more Destructive Falshoods? How wretchedly do they pervert the Word of God to serve the Vilest Purposes, even to justifie Rebellion and King-killing.

But he taxes the Doctor, Page 13, with a more Heinous Crime, *viz.* Of Insincerity, —— of dealing deceitfully with the Word of God: It is surprizing he had not tax'd him with Blasphemy or Apostacy too.

An Instance of the Doctor's Insincerity he gives us, Page 14, where he says, the Word ψευδαδελφια, (for so he writes

writes it,) which the Doctor explains, is a New-coin'd Word, and not to be found in the Old or New Testament. Either the Answerer ought to go to School again, and learn his *Greek* Alphabet, or he must own himself equally guilty of Coining: For I dare be confident with him, that such a Term of Art is to be found neither in the Bible, nor in any Prophane Author.

However, I had not been so severe upon him for such a Mistake, had he not been so Rude upon the Doctor for an Addition of a Syllable; possibly it was only an Error of the Press. But for the Doctor's Word, Ψευδαδελφία. ——If this Answerer understands *Greek*, (which is hard for a Man to do that cannot rightly spell it,) he may often find the Terms Ψεῦδος and Ἀδελφος, even in the Bible; and then he need only consider them jointly in the Abstract, and he shall find no Cause of complaining, that this is an Addition to the Word of God.

Really, Sir, I know not whether I am not more asham'd, or (to use his own Terms) more sick, or weary, of such a trifling Answerer. He has nothing to do but to carp at single Words and Syllables. I shall have done with him after that I have remark'd to you—— how odious and contemptible this Malicious Writer endeavours to render the Doctor to his Ecclesiastical, as well as Civil, Governours, on Purpose that he and his Blood thirsty Party may bring about their Villainous Designs against him. But 'tis hop'd our Good Ministers will not be wheedled by them: For, Sir, the Eyes of the whole Nation are now upon them, expecting the Issue of these Proceedings.

I cann't see where the Doctor has reflected in his Sermon on the Good Bishops of *Worcester*, and of *Litchfield* and *Coventry*, (from whom, this Splenatick Scribbler says, the Doctor receiv'd his Education, and his little Cure, as he terms it in Contempt. He tells us News: The Rector or Vicar owes his Cure to the Bishop. Yes; and so does the Bishop his Bishoprick to the Queen. Does he not know it is the Bishop's Duty to fill all Vacant Cures? And to make Choice of the Fittest Persons to serve them? And how then does one Minister owe his Cure to the Bishop more than another? On the Contrary, in many Dioceses the Bishops are oblig'd to their Curates, and not their Curates to them. I suppose it will be allow'd, that it is the Bishop's Duty to see that all the Churches in his Diocese be duly serv'd: And is not he oblig'd to any Minister that serves so many of them for so small a Pittance? But I let this pass, ——and only take Notice of One Invidious Reflection

flection more, which this Saucy Answerer casts upon the Doctor's Birth and Family. The Doctor is well known to be originally descended from Ancestors of great Merit and Fortunes; and it is many a Noble Family's Case to be reduc'd to a low Estate. He that abuses any Man of Merit upon this Account, is of the Devil's Extraction, of a Base Reviling Spirit; and reproaches not the MAN, but his MAKER, *who hath made him to differ from another.*

And whereas this Author makes an Apology for himself, and says he had not done it, had it not been to shew the Doctor's Ingratitude to his Benefactors; let him consider he could not shew his Gratitude to his Benefactors more effectually than by telling them of their Duty, and Stirring them up to a Conscientious Discharge of it, and *not to suffer Sin* to lie upon them. He that does this out of a Conscientious Principle, without Fawning, Sneaking, or *having Mens Persons in Admiration*, because of Advantage, is a Man, for his Rarity, to be lov'd and respected.

As for the Doctor's Prayer for the Queen, (which this Author reflects upon for the Shortness of it,) I dare be confident, there is more Sincerity in it, because it proceeds from a Heart, whose Principles are truly Loyal,) than in all the Whining, Selfish, and Strain'd, Addresses of his Fanatical Crew. One would wonder that the Answerer should make so Malicious a Suggestion when he could not but know that the Doctor, in the very First Page of his Sermon, gives Her Sacred Majesty this very Hearty, Loyal, and Just, Character. *This Good and Pious Relick of the Royal Family, sits now happily upon the Throne of Her Great Ancestors*; happily in respect, I hope, of the Honest Doctor in particular, in that She *will not deliver him up into the Hands of his* Enemies. O most Sacred Queen, receive him into your Royal Protection!

Sir, I am afraid I have trespass'd upon your Patience already; but I crave leave only to make a Remark or Two upon the other Phamphlet, entituled, *Doctor* Sacheverell's *Recantation*.

There is nothing new in that Tedious Pamphlet but the Preface, which, the Publisher says, is the Work of a very Learned and Judicious Writer. But his Prefacer (whoever he is) is of the same Stamp with the Author of the True Answer: For, in the very First Paragraph of his Preface he endeavours to impose a most Notorious Untruth upon the World: Which is this, —— He tells us, his Book had now past the Seventh Impressions, and had not yet receiv'd any Answer: Which is false in Fact; for there have been several Books publish'd since the First Edition of that, that

may

may ſerve for an Anſwer to THAT, and to all other Pamphlets of its Kind. This Pamphlet indeed ſeems to have been itſelf deſign'd for an Anſwer to the Church of *England* for the Unreaſonableneſs of their Seperation from it; but becauſe it was not thought worth any Man's Pains to give it a Formal Reply, the Prefacer to this laſt Impreſſion of it, has the Vanity to think, and the Confidence to boaſt, that it is unanſwerable.

If the Publiſher had read the *London* Caſes, or Doctor *Hearn*'s Books, or ſome others on the ſame Subject, he might have found his Book anſwer'd long before; and ſince he now (upon the Account of Doctor *Sacheverell*'s Troubles) trumps upon us on Antiquated *Grub ſtreet* Republican Author, I ſhall meet this their *Goliath* with a Second of an Old Honeſt Loyaliſt in the Reign of King *Charles* II.

And, Sir, if you pleaſe, we will leave it to theſe Two Champions to decide the Battle for us.

Whereas then the Author of the Preface ſays, that the Diſſenters, to the Number of 8000, were perſecuted in King *Charles* II's Time purely upon the Score of Religion, my Author proves the Contrary, namely, that the Diſſenter in King *Charles*'s Time were not perſecuted as Saints, but puniſhed as Rebels and Malefactors. And this he does by ſtating the True Notion of Perſecution after the following Method.

To be perſecuted for Righteouſneſs Sake, is after either of theſe Three Ways. (1.) For perſevering patiently and ſteadfaſtly in the Profeſſion of the Chriſtian Faith. Or, (2.) For the Performance of that Duty which we owe to God the Father, and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and to our Chriſtian Brethren, for their Sakes. Or, (3) When we are perſecuted (as we are by the Church of *Rome*) becauſe we don't own that as an Article of Faith, or any Part of Chriſtian Worſhip, which God hath not declar'd to be ſo: For, ſeeing this cannot be done without making Profeſſion of a Lie, or ſaying, we believe what we can ſee no Reaſon to believe: To ſuffer for this Cauſe, is evidently to ſuffer becauſe we will not play the Hypocrites, or give the Lie to our own Conſciences; and therefore, in St. *Peter*'s Language, is to ſuffer for Conſcience towards God, and ſo to ſuffer wrongfully, and for Righteouſneſs Sake. Now, from hence we may learn the True, Clear, and Diſtinct, Definition of Perſecution.

Perſecution then is an Inflicting of Outward Temporal Evils for the Exerciſe of True Religion. Theſe Outward Temporal Evils are Threefold. (1.) Upon the Body, as Baniſhment, Impriſonment, Tortures, and Death. Or, (2.) Upon the Eſtate, as Pecuniary Mulcts, and Confiſcation

tion of Goods. Or, (3.) Upon One's Reputation and Good Name, as Slanderings, Revilings, and Reproachful Speeches; in which Sense the Church of *England* is daily persecuted by the Dissenters.

The Exercise of True Religion is the *Ratio Formalis*, i. e. the Constitutive Difference whereby Persecution is distinguish'd from all other Violences whatsoever. For let the greatest Reproaches and Indignities usher in the most Exquisite Tortures, and let them be concluded by a Death as Cruel as the utmost Malice on Earth, or Fury in Hell, can contrive, yet unless these Tortures be inflicted for the Sake and Cause of Religion, we may call them indeed Merciless, Inhuman, Unnatural, Cruelties, (or any such like Name,) but not Persecution. There can be no Persecution but for Religion, I mean the True Religion: And therefore the Dissenters Clamour of being Persecuted in King *Charles* II's Time, or since, by endeavouring to suppress them, is nothing to the Purpose, and is only a *Cant*, design'd to render the Church more odious to their Party, by representing us as Barbarous and Cruel. To explain this more fully.

By Religion, I mean the Worship of God; and by the True Religion, the Worshipping him according to his Will; the which Will it hath pleased him to deliver to us in Writing, by the Ministry of the Prophets and Apostles, in those Books (which by Way of Eminency) we call Scriptures; so that whatever Worship is not according to those Holy Oracles is not true and acceptable, but false and vain; it being an Undoubted Truth, that God hath as much Right to appoint the Way of his own Worship, as to be worshipped. There are moreover Two Parts of Religion, *Credenda*—& —*Agenda*, i. e. Truths to be believ'd and Duties to be performed, and in both these, the Scripture is to be our Rule and Direction.

He thereof that is punished, either for believing those Truths, or doing those Duties, the Belief and Performance of which the Holy Scripture requireth of him; or he that is punished for not believing those Things as Truths, which are but Falsities and Lies; or for not doing those Things as Duties, which are sinful and unlawful; he I say, who is punished upon these Accounts is properly and truly persecuted.

The Case then about Persecution, as it doth respect the Dissenters, is briefly this. If those Instances, for which they were punish'd, be no Way requir'd of them in Holy Scripture, either for Belief or Practice: And if it shall appear, upon Enquiry, that the Church of *England* requires

nothing

nothing of them that is in Faith erroneous, or in Practice impious: If she enjoins them neither to believe Lies, nor to commit any Sin: If not so, nor so, let the World then judge where the Fault lay, and who they are (that without Repentance, which 'tis fear'd is now little thought of,) are accountable for all those Seperations and Divisions in the Church, and all those Distractions, Wars, Murders, Rapines (the Natural Consequents of the former,) in the State, which these Poor, Miserable, Divided, Kingdoms have so sadly experienc'd.

O! But say the Clamorous Dissenters, Preaching and Praying, are necessary Duties; but they were punished for them, and therefore punished for necessary Duties, and consequently Persecuted. But we deny they were punished for Preaching and Praying, *Quoad Substantiam*, as necessary Duties; but they were punished for not observing those Circumstances about Preaching and Praying, which Authority requireth of them; or they were punished for not performing those Duties in such a Decent Manner as their Governours require: Or more plainly yet, they were punished for not observing and submitting to those Constitutions which their Governours have established for the better ordering of these Duties.

Now since it is necessary that there be some Circumstances made use of in the Exercise of these Duties, Preaching and Praying;) and since the Scripture hath determined nothing, either by requiring some as necessary, or forbidding others as unlawful; and since to leave them undetermined (for Private Persons to do what seems Good in their own Eyes) is apparently destructive both to Church and State; what can more naturally follow than this? *viz.* That these Circumstances must be determined by the Supream Magistrate, who by the Advice of his Ecclesiastical Counsel, (his Convocation) may appoint the Performance of these and other Religious Duties in such a manner as is most agreeable to that Apostolical Canon, *Let all Things be done in Decency and Order.*

The Examples of the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah* may sufficiently encourage all Religious Magistrates, to reform and settle Religion in one Uniform Way, and take Care that all under their Government should serve the Lord with one Voice; this being not a Tyranny over Men, but a Privilege of the Gospel.

And since the Publick Allowance of different Opinions and Practices about Circumstantials in Religion, (particularly about Preaching and Praying,) doth naturally improve into Contentious Disputes, and these Disputes, (if not restrain'd) break out in Civil Wars, (for Men will at last take up Sword

Swords and Spears instead of Pens, and defend by Arms what they cannot do by Argument,) since Things, I say, are thus, 'tis at least Prudence (if not Duty) in the Supream Power to remove the Occasion of this Ruin, by enjoining the Publick Practice of these Duties in one Uniform Way, that all his Subjects may speak the same Thing, and that there be no Divisions amongst them. If therefore upon Enquiry, it doth appear that the Magistrate hath Power to make Constitutions for the better ordering these Circumstances, about which Scripture hath determined nothing, whether we must use, or not use, them; and if Offenders against these Constitutions are justly punishable, it undeniably follows that in punishing such Violaters of his Laws, the Magistrate doth not Persecute, but execute Justice; and that those, who are thus justified by our late Pamphleteer, were not persecuted as Saints, but punished as Rebels and Malefactors; which was the very Case of the Nonconformists in King *Charles* the Second's Time.

And now, Sir, I leave it to the whole World to judge whether my Author, (by Stating thus the True Notion of Persecution, and the Case between the Church and Dissenters,) has not sufficiently vindicated the former from that Malicious Imputation of persecuting the latter.

There remains only a Word or Two more to be said, in Reference to Dr. *Sacheverell*'s Case. The Generality of Gentle and Simple cann't see any Crime in his Sermon, for which he may be punished. And it is hop'd that those Great Men, who are (only suppos'd to be) therein reflected upon, will consider that the Doctor was call'd before the greatest Magistracy in *England*; that he Preach'd to those with whom in a great Measure our Religion and Civil Liberties are entrusted, and that upon all such Publick Occasions the Magistrates Duty is most proper to be insisted upon.

If out of a Conscientious Principle of discharging his Duty to God, his Queen and Country, he took upon him to admonish or correct some Ministers, this, 'tis hop'd will not be made use of by them, as an Advantage against him, seeing *he is their Brother*, and of the same *Hope* and *Calling*. If he had neglected doing this (when he thought it was his Duty) to please some Mutinous, Restless, and Self-interested Party of Men, he had sinned against his Conscience, and (at least in his own Judgment) at once become a Rebel to God and the Government, and accordingly had deserved to be dealt with as a Traytor to Both.

'Tis

'Tis true, the Doctor is highly blam'd for meddling with State Affairs in his Pulpit: But why then are his Adversaries, who answer him in the same Way, encourag'd and countenanced? The Doctor had greater Reason to meddle with Politicks than any Common Country Pastor can pretend to; for he preach'd before an Honourable Magistracy, a Learned Auditory, and Judicious Enquirers into these Things: But a Country Pastor has nothing of this to plead for himself; and yet we have some such Chapmen, who, to blow up the Coal, or to please a Particular Person or Party of Men, in order to skrew themselves into better Benefices, will rail vehemently to their Auditors against a Man of their own Profession; and be so far from being asham'd of it as to publish and justifie it to the World.

Now methinks such a Temporizer does more Harm upon a Thanksgiving-day then he can repair in the Labour of his whole Ministry; because he makes his People jealous of the Ministry, wavering, and unstable, in their Principles, and confirms the Separatists in their Errors.

Now Dr. Atterbury, look to your self; ----these Men think they have a Brave Time of it. Puffed up with Success and Self-conceit, H---y and Ch---n will have at you Bishops, Deans, and all, Right or Wrong. But not too fast, I pray: Many a one has had a Fall by making too much haste. Preferments don't always come by Merit. Scribble on; but you will be no more taken Notice of in this Reign.

If I were Worthy to advise you, take a little Respite: And turn and bend your Thoughts to discharge the Duty of your Calling, to exercise your selves in the great Duty of Prayer, Self denial, Humility, Meekness, and Submission to the Higher Powers. Be not Wise in your own Conceit, nor think of your selves above what you ought to think; but think to Sobriety, and this is the wisest and surest Step to Preferment.

As for the Doctor, it were more becoming you to pity and bewail his Misfortune, rather than incense the Dissenters against him.

Sir, We have now only to pray you, as being our Representative, to act (with Respect to the Doctor,) with that Clemency and Moderation so much contended for in behalf of his Adversaries. We are ready with the Dr. to Sacrifice our Lives and Estates in Defence of Her Sacred Majesty's Person, Crown, and Dignity, and of the Church of England, against Popery and Fanaticism: And whilst we heartily thank God, and the Best of Queen's, for the Blessings we enjoy under Her Government, we cease not earnestly to implore the King of Kings, to grant the Queen a long Life, the Blessings of an Honourable and Lasting Peace, that She may ever be, (as She is,) the Breath of our Nostrils, and the Glory of the World.

FINIS.